



**Sand Point Advisory Committee
March 3, 2022
Sand Point City Council Chambers**

- I. Call to Order: [6:02 PM] by Patrick Brown
- II. Roll Call
Members Present: Patrick Brown

Kylie Thompson
Ben Mobeck Sr.

Emil Mobeck

George Gundersen

John Foster

Members Absent (Excused): N/A

Members Absent (Unexcused): N/A

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 4

List of User Groups Present:
- III. Fish and Game Staff Present: Taryn O'Connor-Brito (Boards Support), Cassie Whiteside (Shellfish), Lisa Fox (Area Biologist- Finfish), Jeff Wadle (Area Biologist - Finfish)
- IV. Guests Present: Rick Eastlick, Alvin Osterback Jr., Amy Foster, Jack Foster Jr., Jim Smith, Dwain Foster Sr., Taylor Lundgren
- V. Approval of Agenda - Unanimous Consent
- VI. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes - Unanimous consent
- VII. New Business - Proposal 264: Change regulation regarding checking Dungeness pots from 14 days to 30 days in Area J
 - a. Discussion: George suggests taking No Action in favor of Prop 265.
 - b. Patrick: ADFG in favor of a compromise with a 21-day rule, not in favor of repealing the rule.
 - c. Cassie: Current regulation is to check pots every 14 days. Increase of abandoned pots, concern for ghost fishing, prompted the regulation initially. Department wants people to manage gear better.
 - d. Patrick: Why not 30 days?
 - e. Cassie: Degradable cottons in the pots will disintegrate by 30 days. The Department is not looking to get rid of the regulation entirely. Looking to reduce gear loss and ghost fishing mortality. Current ghost mortality estimated at 2-7% of harvest.
 - f. Discussion: would rather see 30 days because sometimes the weather in Beaver Bay is too rough to check pots, one time for over a month. Processor timing with deliveries, etc. How will this be enforced?
 - g. Action on Prop 264 Support 6-0

Proposal 265: Repeal of the 14-day Dungeness pot checking rule

Kylie: move to adopt, seconded by George

Kylie: suggest no action based on action in support of Proposal 264

Jim Smith (author of Prop 265): With regards to comments by the Department, that repealing the law is not favored, the author voiced he plans to retract his proposal in favor of Proposal 264.

Kylie: moves to take no action, seconded by John



Asks for unanimous consent, heard
No Action on Prop 265

Proposal 267: to establish pot limits in the Dungeness fishery Area J

Move to adopt by George, seconded

Cassie: Current regulation, open access, no vessel length, no pot limit or GH, regulated by size, sex, season. Enforcement might include buoy tags. 500 pots, \$1.50 per tag. Might deter larger vessels from fishing, with limit. 10,000 pot cap would require a pre-season registration. Late vessels may not be able to register. Maybe try to do a pot limit first and consider a pot cap later.

George (author of Prop 267): Wrote the proposal because its getting pretty crowded. Should be some limit. Bigger boats against it. Might favor limited entry, but that is something that takes time.

Kylie: Is there a 58' limit in this area?

Cassie: No, no length restriction in this area.

Kylie: Easier to live with a limit than a cap.

Discussion: 58' limit could work better. A 58' vessel could haul a couple thousand pots. How big have vessels in the fishery historically been?

How many pots in the water last year? - over 12,000

Best bet is to go for 500 pot limit.

George: would like to amend proposal to remove 10,000 pot cap.

Kylie: A boat could register and not participate and still drop the pot limit [in a pot cap scenario].

George: moves to amend Proposal 267 to strike out "overall cap of 10,000 pots"

Kylie: 2nds

Discussion: 500 pot limit seems like it might help the smaller boat fleet (<58') by making the fishery harder for a larger boat to participate in and be profitable. Most community vessels are 58' and under. No monetary benefit if outside boats are drawn up from other areas, lower 48. The CFEC hasn't limited a fishery (limited entry) in quite some time, probably won't happen here soon.

Amendment carries 6-0

Question on Prop 267 as amended

Carries 5-0 as amended (1 abstained)

George: plans on submitting an RC to his proposal.

Proposal 282: Change the fishing schedule in the June and Post-June Fisheries of South Alaska Peninsula (Area M)

Kylie: Motion to Adopt, 2nd'd

John: Completely opposed.

Kylie: (to Department): Did previous Emergency Order closures in June and July in recent years have a noticeable effect on Chignik escapement?

Lisa Fox: In 2018 and 2020, fisheries were reduced because escapement was super low in Chignik. Its hard to speak to the effect...

Kylie: It hasn't seen a measurable effect when it should be obvious?

What does it mean to predict the mid-point of the early run? -400,000

Mid-point of 350,000-450,000

Tricky wording



Jeff Wadle: We would “project” to hit 400,000 escapement, but we wouldn’t have to hit it. If we expect to hit middle of goal, we will open Chignik fishery and with this proposal we would open the South Peninsula (Area M).

Kylie: It would also cut July fishing in half. The Chignik run is traditionally switched over to the Late Run (Chignik Lake) by then. Lack of fishing effort lately in Chignik in order to conserve the Early Run, late into July.

Seems so allocative.

If Chignik gets a pink or chum opener does it let us off the hook?

They aren’t really even managed on pinks or chums.

I don’t see the conservation effect if they didn’t see a noticeable spike in Chignik escapement when the South Pen. stops fishing. Majority of the effort is focused on West-bound fish. SEDM hasn’t even been opened for 4-5 years now.

Jack Foster Jr. : Closer to 10 years since we’ve had enough time to make a living [fishing SEDM]. In 2012 we fished continually on SEDM and didn’t even have any effect on the Chignik run. The fishery was allocated when we went to a permit system [limited entry]. Every couple years they try to make changes now. This fishery is very important to our communities here and the amounts of people these regulations effect. We can’t push the fleet out west, theres not enough room. When the fleet is spread out, theres less of an impact. The new regulations are discriminatory towards our fishermen.

Patrick: For the test years of WASSIP component, what were the percentages of Black Lake fish in the Shumagins?

Kylie: Low for the Shumagins in June and even lower in July. Dolgoi wasn’t bad either. Except one year there was an anomaly in the Dolgoi Section, which has now been remedied in 2019. Now we have only 20 set netters left in Dolgoi. Set netters should not be further west, where they will have to go if this passes. Major safety issue for smaller boats. Sand Point Trident is nearly closed, if they can’t stay open, even Chignik won’t have a nearby processor. Ocean Beauty won’t be buying there this upcoming Summer. If the Shumagins are shut down, they won’t even be able to stay open.

Lisa: Pink salmon forecast is low, but similar to 2 years ago, probably. We met the goal in 2020 and had a surplus on an even year. First fishing in August on an even year since 2008.

Kylie: Will we be on local management for July 30th opening?

Lisa: Allocation typically goes though the 25th of July for the Dolgoi section. Theres a lot of terminal harvest area in the Dolgoi Islands section that is open before that.

Kylie: This proposal would rewrite the Dolgoi islands section management plan.

Patrick: Does it seem feasible to restructure the whole July schedule for the Shumagin Islands and Dolgoi Section when the transition period for the Early run has transition to the Late run and has tailed off?

Lisa: Black Lake escapement goal goes through late-July, and the lower end of the goal is 350,000 beginning July 20. I think once you get that far into July, its more likely Chignik will have had a commercial opening and the escapement goal range would not be a part of the decision making process, as far as openings in the S. Pen, if this proposal passes.

Rick Eastlick : Any action that the Board takes this year, would you need a lot more information to continue the policy?

Lisa: The outcome of the meeting should have clearly written rules. Unsure of the question.

Rick Eastlick: Would decisions made this cycle continue long term?

Lisa: This proposal will go for one season, then...

Kylie: When the Board took seiners out of the Dolgoi in June, have we seen any benefit of that yet, in regards to Chignik escapement? Has it been long enough to see that impact?

Lisa: In regards to escapement in Chignik going up? That change was made in the first year of 3 bad years. It’s hard to make correlations on the impact from seiners in Dolgoi and Chignik escapement. Haven’t seen any direct impact between the two, other than by removing seiners, the amount of fish harvested in the Dolgoi Islands Section in June has gone down considerably. The amount of sockeye harvested overall has gone down.



Kylie: And theres clearly been no benefit to the Chignik run?

Lisa: I'm sure that some fish that are harvested in the Dolgoi islands section could have gone to Chignik, but theres no measurable way to do that kind of math.

John Foster: If the Board changes something, we have about a week to submit proposals for the next Board cycle. Is there any way to change the deadline.

Jeff: No, you'll have to anticipate these changes.

John: Seems unfair. Proposals due April 11, this meeting will be over April 2. We don't know what we need to put in a proposal.

Kylie: We never put in proposals for any other areas, now we are in a meeting out of cycle. It's ridiculous.

Alvin Osterback: SEDM has been closed 6 years. Has there been any positive effect in Chignik from that?

Lisa: Something is going on in Chignik, not really sure. Escapement is low.

Jack Foster Jr. : I used to fish SEDM, then they pushed me to the Shumagin Islands. Now, they are trying to push me somewhere else. It's not allocation, it's discrimination. We are commercial fishermen not being governed by a group of our peers. This fishery was allocated in the 70s, and these allocations have changed 3 or 4 times every 10 years since then, all proposals against us from other areas.

Question called

Final Action Proposal 282

0-6

- VIII. Set next meeting date: Dates will be in Anchorage during the Board meetings every evening. At a room reserved by the AEB. March 29th, 30th, 31st, April 1.
- IX. Approval of Minutes by Emil, Motion by Kylie, 2nd'd unanimous consent
- X. Adjourn 8:02 PM

Minutes Recorded By: Patrick Brown
Minutes Approved By: Emil Mobeck
Date: 3/9/22

Alaska Board of Fisheries: General Shellfish and Miscellaneous Sport Proposals			
March 26- April 2, 2022 Anchorage, AK			
Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support/ Support as amended/Oppose/No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (pros & cons), Voting Notes, Amendments



Note: Effective September 2019, when abstentions occur, the action or decision of a majority of the remaining members at a meeting at which a quorum is present is an act of the committee. For example, a vote tally of 7-6-2 means the motion carries. Members abstaining from voting must provide an explanation that is included in the committee record.

264	Amend regulation requiring operation of Dungeness crab pot gear once within a 14-day period, as follows:		
Support	6	0	
265	Repeal regulation requiring operation of Dungeness crab pot gear once within a 14-day period, as follows:		
N/A			
267	Establish South Peninsula District Dungeness crab pot limits, as follows:		
Support	5	0	
282	Modify South Unimak and Shumagin Islands June fishery and Modify the Post-June Salmon Management Plan for the South Alaska Peninsula		
Oppose	0	6	



**Sand Point Advisory Committee
10/6/2021
Sand Point City Chambers**

I. Call to Order: 12:07 by Patrick Brown, Chair

II. Roll Call

Members Present: Patrick Brown (Chair), Ben Mobeck Sr., George Gundersen Sr. Kylie Thompson (Secretary)

Members Absent (Excused): John Foster, Emil Mobeck

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 4

III. Approval of Agenda

IV. Introductions

Fish and Game Staff Present:

Lisa Fox, Area Biologist

Tyler Lawson

Nat Nichols, Groundfish/Shellfish

Jeff Wadle, Area Biologist

Cassandra Whiteside, Shellfish Assistant

Taryn O'Connor-Brito, Boards Support

Guests Present:

Ernie Weiss

Charlotte Levy

Arlene Gundersen

V. Elections

George moves to reinstate everyone and keep current positions

Discussion: no other guests or community members wish to join AC

Unanimous vote in favor

Expiration of Terms:

6/2022 George, Ben

6/2023 John, Emil

6/2024 Patrick, Kylie

VI. Elections for Officers

George moves to keep everything as is

Unanimous vote in favor

Reports:

ADF&G

Nat Nichols- finished trawl survey for Tanner crab. Will have information available shortly regarding a 2022 season.

Public Comments

AC Comments

Deadline for proposals for the next cycle is April 11, 2022

New Business

Kylie- Move to adopt ACRs 6 and 7

George- second

ACRs 6 (Chignik Intertribal Coalition) and 7 (Don Bumpus)



-Written by CMA constituents with the intent of altering the June and post-June schedules for Area M fishermen

-Out of cycle proposals, allocative in nature

-Why don't they meet the criteria of ACRs?

- Allocative

Discussion:

Kylie : Not an unforeseen issue to solve. BOF took action in 2019 when it changed the Dolgoi Islands fishery, and we haven't even had a chance to see if the new policies work yet.

-The schedule was realigned so there's no overlap in fishing. Now, there is time with gear out of the water.

-No merit as an ACR, no unforeseen issues to correct.

- The Board addressed these issues very recently in the 2019 meeting.

PJ: Current schedule we are on, we've been on, with amendments, since 2004.

The Board already had a chance to change our fishery, and they did, and we haven't had a chance to see the new changes through.

Kylie: Board Policy for ACRs is that they meet the 3 requirements in the ACR policy, and these ACRs don't meet the criteria to be accepted.

- Department said it didn't meet the 3 requirements.

ADFG didn't use emergency order capability to shut down the Area M fishery, when it could have, had there been in an emergency.

The Chignik run is very weak right now, but not to the point it can't come back.

Any changes the Board makes would be allocative in nature, which goes against ACR policy.

They are trying to allocate fish from one area to another.

If it was a conservation issue (a stock of concern), the Department would have restricted our fishery this year (2021), like they did in 2018 and 2020.

Lisa: There were modifications to the management plan in 2018 and in 2020, and we didn't do anything in 2019 because we had just come out of BOF where changes had been made. And no modifications in 2021. As far as staff comments go, the department said no, it wasn't a conservation purpose or reason. Didn't meet the criteria.

Kylie: Not a stock of conservation [concern], it's an allocation issue. Nothing unforeseen has happened since 2019. The run is weak, they should have kept the weir up longer to count as many fish as possible. But the reasons for an ACR are not there. We agree with the Department that this is not a conservation issue.

Lisa: Chignik weir was pulled after it reached its late run goals. There are funding issues in the Department that hinder keeping the weir open.

-Early run is the weaker run, the concerns that we are discussing.

Jeff: The weir was pulled on a normal timing, but it had remained open longer in the most recent years because of extra funding and poorer runs.

Kylie: Is the genetic information from the Chignik weir all done after the season?

Jeff: All the in season genetic data was run after it was collected. In season genetic data (for 2021) should be available.

The run data will be reapportioned for early and late runs.

PJ: In river escapement goals have been adjusted and readjusted in recent years?



Jeff: Yes, from 25k-75k, for August and September, and now reduced from 75k-10k.

PJ: Was fishing restricted by raising the goals?

Jeff: We managed around the goal, often by increasing opportunity in July and reducing opportunity until in river goals could be met in August. But it probably did affect fishing opportunity.

PJ: What was the reasoning of reducing in-river goals?

Jeff: Mostly, the argument stemmed around subsistence opportunity for people in the [Chignik] Lake.

They could reduce the amount of fish going by, but give subsistence users better available opportunity.

Charlotte: Reconstructed Early run escapement is 20,000 less than reported originally.

Jeff: Staff will be available at the meeting to address those questions about reconstructed numbers.

Kylie (To Jeff): Has Chignik early run met minimum escapement to not be considered a stock of concern? What is the number when it's considered a stock of concern? What is the criteria?

Jeff: No, Chignik hasn't met the criteria to be considered a stock of concern. But if they haven't met the lower escapement goal (350,000) in 3 out of 5 years it would be considered a stock of concern. If we were going into a Board cycle, we'd probably declare it a stock of concern. But since it's out of cycle, they haven't considered this a stock of concern. Next summer if the lower escapement goal isn't met, it will be considered a stock of concern.

Kylie: Is there any talk of reducing the escapement goal for Black Lake? If the carrying capacity of the lake has been reduced over time, shouldn't the escapement goals of that system be reduced and adjusted over time?

Jeff: There is research being worked on right now, yet to be determined, that will address this issue. Recommendations will be on this yet to be released report available for the next Board cycle.

Kylie: I hate to see them address these issues out of cycle without all the relevant information. There's a lot of unanswered questions, if we wait for the cycle, we will have all of the information we need to make better decisions. No one doubts there are issues with Black Lake system, but we don't exactly know what they are. The Board should wait until all the relevant information is out. Our fishery, based on WASSIP data, doesn't really have that large of an effect on the Chignik fishery.

Kylie moved to support, seconded

Vote to support ACRs 6 and 7 with comments referenced

0-4 in favor of supporting ACRs 6 and 7

Adjourn 1:16 PM

Minutes Recorded By: Patrick Brown
Minutes Approved By: Sand Point AC
Date: 3/3/22